

REMARKS

At page 2 of the April 20 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 409 and 417 still in the case. The Examiner is correct that the poor quality the fax copy was the reason for difficulty in reading certain words in claims 409 and 417. As requested by the Examiner, claims 409 and 417 are again presented herein as previously presented claims in which the Examiner can see that the informalities noted were strictly due to poor quality the fax copy.

At page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 408, 409-410, 417-419, 420, and 421 were all allowable pending either resolution of the informalities or placing respective claims into independent form. This has been done in the presentation of claims herein. Thus these claims are all now allowable.

A third substitute specification and a marked copy thereof showing changes with respect to the second substitute specification are enclosed.

The third substitute specification includes a changed Summary and Abstract. Also preferred embodiment descriptions now occur after the drawing figures. Also, at page 31, line 3 the laser radiation source 1 is described as comprising at least one or a plurality of diode-pumped fiber lasers. As disclosed at page 40, line 3, one can begin with one fiber laser. Also see page 35, line 19, indicating again the use of one fiber laser. See also page 56, line 20, describing Fig. 15 showing a single laser fiber 5.

The Examiner rejected now canceled claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Pernick.

The newly presented claims 422-709 distinguish over Pernick at least for the following reasons. Claim 422 recites a rotogravure engraving system for engraving half-tone cups for receiving printing fluid into a printing form comprising a rotatable

rotogravure printing drum having a round outer metal peripheral processing surface. This language of the preamble must be given patentable weight since it is reinforced in the body of the claim which recites this rotatable rotogravure printing drum, recites the metal processing surface and recites creating the half-tone cups for printing fine structure rotogravure images or text by removing metal material from the processing surface. Pernick is irrelevant for all of these claimed features since Pernick is an optical correlator using fiber optics lasers having nothing to do with printing. Therefore, one skilled in the art would never consult Pernick to solve problems in the rotogravure engraving system printing art.

Claim 422 contains many other features not even remotely suggested in Pernick which does not relate to a rotogravure printing form.

Claims 423-516 also recite the rotogravure engraving system or method and therefore Pernick is also not relevant as to those claims.

Independent claim 517 recites a flexo printing system for use in creating a fine structure for images or text on a processing surface of a flexo printing form mounted on a rotatable drum having a round outer peripheral surface. This preamble language, which must be given patentable weight since it is also picked up in the body of the claim which recites the rotatable drum and the processing surface and wherein the fine structure for images or text in this flexo printing system are created on the processing surface. Pernick is irrelevant since it relates to an optical correlator using fiber optics lasers and has nothing to do with flexo printing. The claim also recites additional features not even remotely suggested in Pernick.

Claims 518-613 similarly recite a flexo printing system or method for a flexo printing form and thus Pernick is equally irrelevant as to those claims.

Claim 614 recites in the preamble which must be given patentable weight an offset printing system for use in creating a fine pattern for images or text on a processing surface of an offset printing form mounted on a rotatable drum having a round outer peripheral surface. The body of the claim also recites the rotatable drum in the processing surface and wherein the fine pattern for images or text is created on the processing surface of the offset printing form. Pernick is irrelevant since Pernick relates to an optical correlator using fiber optics lasers having nothing to do with offset printing or an offset printing form. Claim 614 also recites additional features not even remotely suggested by Pernick.

Claims 615-709 also recite an offset printing system or method and therefore Pernick is also irrelevant as to those claims.

A Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett A. Valiquet (Reg. #27,841)
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-258-5786
Attorneys for Applicant
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CHI\4139109.1